REMARKS

[0002]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the Application. Claims 1-44 are presently pending. Claims 1, 15, 21, 27, 33, and 39 are amended. No claims are withdrawn or canceled and no claims are added.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0003]   If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0004]   Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0005]   Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 15, 21, 27, 33, and 39. The claim amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Further, the claim amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed features in response to the cited references.

[0006]   The claim amendments are fully supported by the originally filed application and do not include new matter. For example, the amendments to claims 1 and 27 are at least supported by paragraphs [0112] – [0115] of the originally filed application. In addition, the amendments to claim 21 are at least supported by paragraphs [0123] – [0126] and Fig. 4 of the originally filed application. Further, the amendments to claim 33 are at least supported by paragraph [0077] of the originally filed application. The amendments to claim 39 are at least supported by paragraphs [0108] – [0110] of the originally filed application.

SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0007]   The arguments presented below point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-44 have not been met.   For example, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1-44.

Based upon Harvey and Doss

[0008]   The Action rejects claims 1-9, 11-16, 20, and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,784,901 ("Harvey") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,323 ("Doss").   Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0009]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 1:

- "receiving a selection of a message edit action at the computing device, wherein the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit actions and a first number of the plurality of message

edit actions change data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminate bubble message editing"

- "determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features"

In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Harvey teach a chat message that is displayed with a particular texture, font, color, and point size. (*See* Harvey, col. 16, lines 17-22). The cited portions of Harvey do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action at a computing device, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action with a first number of the plurality of message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 1.

[0010]   Further, the cited portions of Doss do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey. For example, the cited portions of Doss teach a telephone service provider offering enhanced greeting techniques as a type of upgraded subscription service. (*See* Doss, col. 10, ll. 4-7). The cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action at a

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-24-
lee&hayes The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com 509.324.9256

computing device, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action with a first number of the plurality of message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 1.

[0011]   Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable because the cited combination of Harvey and Doss does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-16, and 20

[0012]   Dependent claims 2-9, 11-16, and 20 ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As explained previously, the cited combination of Harvey and Doss does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Thus, the cited art also does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 2-9, 11-16, and 20. Accordingly, claims 2-9, 11-16, and 20 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

[0013]   In addition, the dependent claims include further features that are not taught or suggested by the cited art. For example, with respect to claim 16, page 8, section 19 of the Action cites column 17, lines 1-9 of Doss in rejecting the features of claim 16. The cited portions of Doss teach techniques for selecting a music clip including random selection and algorithmic selection. (*See* Doss, col. 17, ll. 1-9). The cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest that

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-25-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509-324-9256

selecting a number of message edit settings in a constrained random manner includes utilizing an aesthetically determined constraint, as recited in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Independent Claim 33

[0014]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 33:

- "displaying a graphical message close animation that is related to the graphical message open animation, and wherein the graphical message open animation and the graphical message close animation are related to a shape of the graphical message"

The Action indicates that Harvey does not teach or suggest displaying a graphical message close animation that is related to a graphical open animation, where the graphical open animation and the graphical close animation are related to a shape of a graphical message, as recited in claim 33. (*See* page 9, line 5 of the Action).

[0015]   With respect to claim 33 and Doss, page 9 of the Action states:

"However, Doss discloses a bubble message close animation that is related to the bubble message open animation (paragraph [0072])."

Applicant respectfully submits that Doss does not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey. For example, the cited portions of Doss also do not teach or suggest displaying a graphical message close animation that is related to a graphical open animation, where the graphical open animation and the graphical close animation are related to a shape of a graphical message, as recited in claim 33.

[0016]   Accordingly, claim 33 is allowable because the cited combination of Harvey and Doss does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 33 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent claims 34-35

[0017]   Dependent claims 34-35 ultimately depend upon independent claim 33. As explained previously, the cited combination of Harvey and Doss does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 33. Thus, the cited art also does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 34-35. Accordingly, claims 34-35 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey, Doss, and Dodd

[0018]   The Action rejects claims 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey and Doss in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,211 ("Dodd"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-27-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509-324-9256

[0019]   Claim 10 depends from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Harvey and Doss.   As explained previously, the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action at a computing device, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action with a first number of the plurality of the message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of the message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 1.

[0020]   With respect to Dodd and claim 10, page 10, section 25 of the Action states:

> "With respect to claim 10, the combination of Harvey and Doss discloses the computerized method of claim 1, but fails to disclose visually unwrapping.
>
> However, Dodd discloses the method wherein: displaying the notification (column 4, line 63-67) of the personalized graphical message comprises displaying a wrapped gift (column 5, lines 44-46; Figure 2B shows the "wrapped gift" as the icon element 142); and the graphical message open animation comprises virtually unwrapping the wrapped gift (column 5, lines 53-63; Figure 2E where the "unwrapping" is disclosed upon the recipient positioning the mouse cursor over the present icon and revealing the present)"

However, the cited portions of Dodd do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey and Doss.   For example, the cited portions of Dodd do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action at a computing device,

where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action with a first number of the plurality of the message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of the message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 1.

[0021]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Based upon Harvey, Doss, and Azuma

[0022]   The Action rejects claims 17-19 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey and Doss in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032861 ("Azuma"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 17-19

[0023]   Claims 17-19 depend from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Harvey and Doss. As explained previously, the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action at a computing device, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action

with a first number of the plurality of the message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of the message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 1.

[0024]   With respect to Azuma and claims 17-19, pages 11-12, sections 27-29 of the Action state:

> "27.   With respect to claim 17, Harvey discloses the computerized method of claim 1, however fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.
>
> Azuma discloses the method wherein the personalized graphical message is unmodifiable after creation (paragraph [0026], whereby the unmodifiable message is described by the, "electronic mail is read only")...
>
> 28.   With respect to claim 18, Harvey discloses the computerized method of claim 1, however fails to disclose a feature policy.
>
> Azuma discloses the method wherein displaying the personalized graphical message comprises verifying that the personalized graphical message complies with at least one bubble message feature policy (paragraph [0080])...
>
> 29.   With respect to claim 19, Harvey discloses the computerized method of claim 1, however fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.
>
> Azuma discloses the method wherein said at least one bubble message feature policy comprises a bubble message feature policy inhibiting modification of the personalized graphical message (paragraph [0026])."

However, the cited portions of Azuma do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey and Doss. For example, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or

suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action at a computing device, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action with a first number of the plurality of the message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of the message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining, at the computing device, whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 1.

[0025]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 17-19.   Accordingly, claims 17-19 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 36-38

[0026]   Claims 36-38 depend from claim 33, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Harvey and Doss.   As explained previously, the Action indicates that Harvey does not teach or suggest displaying a graphical message close animation that is related to a graphical open animation, where the graphical open animation and the graphical close animation are related to a shape of a graphical message, as recited in claim 33.

[0027]   With respect to Azuma and claims 36-38, pages 12-13, sections 30-32 of the Action state:

> "30.   With respect to claim 36, Harvey discloses the computerized method of claim 33, however fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-31-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509-324-9256

Azuma discloses the computerized system wherein the received personalized graphical message is unmodifiable (paragraph [0026], whereby the inhibited modification of the message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only')...

31.   With respect to claim 37, Harvey discloses the computerized method of claim 33, however fails to disclose a feature policy.

Azuma discloses the computerized system wherein displaying the received personalized graphical message comprises verifying that the received personalized graphical message complies with at least one bubble message feature policy (paragraph [0080])...

32.   With respect to claim 38, Harvey discloses the computerized method of claim 33, however fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.

Azuma discloses the computerized system wherein said at least one bubble message feature policy comprises a bubble message feature policy inhibiting modification of the received personalized graphical message (paragraph [0026])."

However, the cited portions of Azuma do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey and Doss. For example, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or suggest displaying a graphical message close animation that is related to a graphical open animation, where the graphical open animation and the graphical close animation are related to a shape of a graphical message, as recited in claim 33.

[0028]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 33, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 36-38. Accordingly, claims 36-38 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey and Szeto

[0029]   The Action rejects claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0215731 ("Szeto"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 21

[0030]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Szeto do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 21:

- "determining whether a number of selected new bubble message notifications exceeds a specified threshold"

- "providing a new bubble message chooser display in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications meets or exceeds the specified threshold, the new bubble message chooser display including details corresponding to the number of new bubble message notifications"

- "adding one or more of the number of new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser display to a bubble message display list in response to user interaction with the one or

more new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser"

- "automatically adding each of the selected new bubble message display notifications to the bubble message display list in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications is less than the specified threshold"

In contrast to claim 21, the cited portions of Harvey teach a chat message that is displayed with a particular texture, font, color, and point size. (*See* Harvey, col. 16, lines 17-22). In addition, the cited portions of Harvey teach comparing the height of a textured message to a maximum height parameter and performing textured message rendering steps until the textured message is vertically displaced to a height on the recipient's viewport that exceeds the maximum height parameter. (*See* Harvey, col. 20, ll. 66 – col. 21, ll. 13). The cited portions of Harvey do not teach or suggest determining whether a number of selected new bubble messages notifications meets a specified threshold and providing a new bubble message chooser display in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications meets the specified threshold, the new bubble message chooser display including details corresponding to the number of new bubble message notifications, as recited in claim 21. Further, the cited portions of Harvey do not teach or suggest adding

one or more of the number of new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser display to a bubble message display list in response to user interaction with the one or more new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser and automatically adding each of the selected new bubble message display notifications to the bubble message display list in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications is less than the specified threshold, as recited in claim 21.

[0031]   The cited portions of Szeto do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey. For example, the cited portions of Szeto teach moving a message received from an instant messaging application to a conversation user interface and causing the received message to be added to a history window if a generic environment is selected. (*See* Szeto, paragraph [0045]). Additionally, the cited portions of Szeto teach a cartoon instant messaging environment, where characters represent participants in an instant messaging session and text bubbles displaying messages sent by a participant may be deleted and inserted into a new text bubble. (*See* Szeto, paragraph [0075]). The cited portions of Szeto do not teach or suggest determining whether a number of selected new bubble messages notifications meets a specified threshold and providing a new bubble message chooser display in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications meets the specified threshold, the new bubble message chooser display including details corresponding to the number of new bubble message notifications, as recited in claim 21. Further, the cited portions of Szeto do not teach or suggest adding one or more of the

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-35-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509-324-9256

number of new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser display to a bubble message display list in response to user interaction with the one or more new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser and automatically adding each of the selected new bubble message display notifications to the bubble message display list in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications is less than the specified threshold, as recited in claim 21.

[0032]   Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable because the cited combination of Harvey and Szeto does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 21 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent claims 22-23

[0033]   Dependent claims 22-23 ultimately depend upon independent claim 21. As explained previously, the cited combination of Harvey and Szeto does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 21. Thus, the cited art also does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 22-23. Accordingly, claims 22-23 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey, Szeto and Azuma

[0034]   The Action rejects claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey and Szeto in view of Azuma. Applicant respectfully

traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

[0035]   Claims 24-26 depend from claim 21, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the combination of Harvey and Szeto. As explained previously, the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Szeto do not teach or suggest determining whether a number of selected new bubble messages notifications meets a specified threshold and providing a new bubble message chooser display in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications meets the specified threshold, the new bubble message chooser display including details corresponding to the number of new bubble message notifications, as recited in claim 21. Further, the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Szeto do not teach or suggest adding one or more of the number of new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser display to a bubble message display list in response to user interaction with the one or more new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser and automatically adding each of the selected new bubble message display notifications to the bubble message display list in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications is less than the specified threshold, as recited in claim 21.

[0036]   With respect to Azuma and claims 24-26, pages 16-17, sections 38-40 of the Action state:

> "38.   With respect to claim 24, the combination of Harvey and Szeto discloses the computerized method of claim 21, but fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.

However, Azuma discloses the method wherein each respective bubble message is unmodifiable (paragraph [0026], whereby the unmodifiable message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only')...

39.   With respect to claim 25, the combination of Harvey and Szeto discloses the computerized method of claim 21, but fails to disclose a feature policy.

However, Azuma discloses the method wherein displaying the respective bubble message comprises verifying that the respective bubble message complies with at least one bubble message feature policy (paragraph [0080])...

40.   With respect to claim 26, the combination of Harvey and Szeto discloses the computerized method of claim 21, but fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.

However, Azuma discloses the method wherein said at least one bubble message feature policy comprises a bubble message feature policy inhibiting modification of the respective bubble message (paragraph [0026], whereby the inhibited modification of the message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only')."

However, the cited portions of Azuma do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey and Szeto. For example, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or suggest determining whether a number of selected new bubble messages notifications meets a specified threshold and providing a new bubble message chooser display in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications meets the specified threshold, the new bubble message chooser display including details corresponding to the number of new bubble message notifications, as recited in claim 21. Further, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or suggest adding one or more of the number of new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser display to a bubble message display list in response to user interaction with the one or more

new bubble message notifications in the new bubble message chooser and automatically adding each of the selected new bubble message display notifications to the bubble message display list in response to determining that the number of selected new bubble message notifications is less than the specified threshold, as recited in claim 21.

[0037]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 21, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 24-26. Accordingly, claims 24-26 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey and Henderson

[0038]   The Action rejects claims 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0178087 ("Henderson").   Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 27

[0039]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Henderson do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 27:

- "receiving a selection of a message edit action, wherein the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit action and a first number of the message edit actions change data associated

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-39-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509-324-9256

with bubble messages and a second number of message edit actions terminate bubble message editing"

- "determining whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features"

- "determining that a lockable bubble message feature of the message edit action is a locked bubble message feature"

- "providing an indication that the lockable bubble message feature is locked"

- "providing an option to purchase bubble message feature unlock keys to unlock the lockable bubble message feature"

- "receiving input related to unlocking the lockable bubble message feature"

In contrast to claim 27, the cited portions of Harvey teach a chat message that is displayed with a particular texture, font, color, and point size. (*See* Harvey, col. 16, lines 17-22). The cited portions of Harvey do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit actions with a first number of the plurality of message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining whether the message edit action is associated with one

or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 27. Further, the cited portions of Harvey do not teach or suggest determining that a lockable bubble message feature of the message edit action is a locked bubble message feature, providing an indication that the lockable bubble message feature is locked, providing an option to purchase bubble message feature unlock keys to unlock the lockable bubble message feature, and receiving input related to unlocking the lockable bubble message feature, as recited in claim 27.

[0040]   Additionally, the cited portions of Henderson do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey. For example, the cited portions of Henderson teach displaying a logon window, requiring a user to complete a registration process before logging on, a lockout period to verify a user's mailing address, and a code to unlock the user's user-end software. (*See* Henderson, paragraph [0070]). The cited portions of Henderson do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit actions with a first number of the plurality of message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminating bubble message editing and determining whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 27. Further, the cited portions of Henderson do not teach or suggest determining that a lockable bubble message feature of the message edit action is a locked bubble message feature, providing an indication that the lockable bubble message feature is locked, providing an option to purchase bubble message feature unlock keys to

unlock the lockable bubble message feature, and receiving input related to unlocking the lockable bubble message feature, as recited in claim 27.

[0041]   Accordingly, claim 27 is allowable because the cited combination of Harvey and Henderson does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 27 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent claims 28-29

[0042]   Dependent claims 28-29 ultimately depend upon independent claim 27.   As explained previously, the cited combination of Harvey and Henderson does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 27.   Thus, the cited art also does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 28-29.   Accordingly, claims 28-29 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey, Henderson, and Azuma

[0043]   The Action rejects claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey and Henderson in view of Azuma.   Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 30-32

[0044]   Claims 30-32 depend from claim 27, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Harvey and Henderson. As explained

previously, the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Henderson do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit actions with a first number of the plurality of message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 27. Further, the cited portions of Harvey and the cited portions of Henderson do not teach or suggest determining that a lockable bubble message feature of the message edit action is a locked bubble message feature, providing an indication that the lockable bubble message feature is locked, providing an option to purchase bubble message feature unlock keys to unlock the lockable bubble message feature, and receiving input related to unlocking the lockable bubble message feature, as recited in claim 27.

[0045] With respect to Azuma, pages 20-21, sections 46-47 of the Action state:

> "46. With respect to claim 30, the combination of Harvey and Henderson discloses the computerized method of claim 27, however fails to disclose an unmodifiable message. Azuma discloses the computerized system of claim 27, wherein the created personalized graphical message is unmodifiable after creation (paragraph [0026], whereby the inhibited modification of the message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only')...

> 47. With respect to claim 31, the combination of Harvey and Henderson discloses the computerized method of claim 27, however fails to disclose a feature policy. Azuma discloses the computerized system of claim 27, wherein displaying the created personalized graphical message comprises verifying that the created personalized

graphical message complies with at least one bubble message feature policy (paragraph [0080])...

With respect to claim 32, the combination of Harvey and Henderson disclose the computerized method of claim 31, however fails to disclose an unmodifiable message. Azuma discloses the computerized system wherein said at least one bubble message feature policy comprises a bubble message feature policy inhibiting modification of the created personalized graphical message (paragraph [0026], whereby the inhibited modification of the message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only')."

However, the cited portions of Azuma do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey and Henderson. For example, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or suggest receiving a selection of a message edit action, where the message edit action is one of a plurality of message edit actions with a first number of the plurality of message edit actions changing data associated with bubble messages and a second number of the plurality of message edit actions terminating bubble message editing, and determining whether the message edit action is associated with one or more lockable bubble message features, as recited in claim 27. Further, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or suggest determining that a lockable bubble message feature of the message edit action is a locked bubble message feature, providing an indication that the lockable bubble message feature is locked, providing an option to purchase bubble message feature unlock keys to unlock the lockable bubble message feature, and receiving input related to unlocking the lockable bubble message feature, as recited in claim 27.

[0046]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 27, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature

of claims 30-32. Accordingly, claims 30-32 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey, Doss, and Lord

[0047] The Action rejects claims 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Doss and further in views of U.S. Patent No. 7,131,003 ("Lord"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 39

[0048] Applicant submits that the cited portions of Harvey, the cited portions of Doss, and the cited portions of Lord do not teach or suggest the following feature as recited in claim 39:

- "creating a graphical message with premium message edit settings associated with a valid subscription to the premium message edit settings"

In contrast to claim 39, the cited portions of Harvey teach a chat message that is displayed with a particular texture, font, color, and point size. (*See* Harvey, col. 16, lines 17-22). The cited portions of Harvey do not teach or suggest creating a graphical message with premium message edit settings associated with a valid subscription to the premium message edit settings, as recited in claim 39.

[0049]   Further, the cited portions of Doss do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey. For example, the cited portions of Doss teach a telephone service provider offering enhanced greeting techniques as a type of upgraded subscription service. (*See* Doss, col. 10, ll. 4-7). The cited portions of Doss do not teach or suggest creating a graphical message with premium message edit settings associated with a valid subscription to the premium message edit settings, as recited in claim 39.

[0050]   Additionally, the cited portions of Lord do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey and Doss. With respect to Lord and claim 39, page 22, section 49 of the Actions states:

"But does not disclose bubble message version data, or closing animations.

However, Lord discloses version data (column 14, lines 24-26)."

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Lord do not teach or suggest creating a graphical message with premium message edit settings associated with a valid subscription to the premium message edit settings, as recited in claim 39.

[0051]   Accordingly, claim 39 is allowable because the cited combination of Harvey, Doss, and Lord does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 39 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent claims 40-41

[0052]   Dependent claims 40-41 ultimately depend upon independent claim 39. As explained previously, the cited combination of Harvey, Doss, and Lord does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 39. Thus, the cited art also does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 40-41. Accordingly, claims 40-41 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Harvey, Lord, Doss, and Azuma

[0053]   The Action rejects claims 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey and Doss in view of Lord, and further in view of Azuma. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 42-44

[0054]   Claims 42-44 depend from claim 39, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited combination of Harvey, Lord, and Doss. As explained previously, the cited portions of Harvey, Lord, and Doss do not teach or suggest creating a graphical message with premium message edit settings associated with a valid subscription to the premium message edit settings, as recited in claim 39.

[0055]   With respect to Azuma and claims 42-44, pages 24-25, sections 53-55 of the Action state:

"53.   With respect to claim 42, the combination of Harvey, Doss, and Lord fails to disclose an unmodifiable message.   However, Azuma discloses the computer-readable medium wherein the bubble message is capable of being marked unmodifiable (paragraph [0026], whereby the inhibited modification of the message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only')...

54.   With respect to claim 43, the combination of Harvey, Doss and Lord fails to disclose a feature policy. However, Azuma discloses the computer-readable medium wherein displaying the bubble message comprises verifying that the bubble message complies with at least one bubble message feature policy (paragraph [0080])...

55.   With respect to claim 44, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 43 above.   In addition, Azuma discloses the computer-readable medium wherein said at least one bubble message feature policy comprises a bubble message feature policy inhibiting modification of the bubble message (paragraph [0026], whereby the inhibited modification of the message is described by the, 'electronic mail is read only'))."

However, the cited portions of Azuma do not make up for the deficiencies of Harvey, Doss, and Lord. For example, the cited portions of Azuma do not teach or suggest creating a graphical message with premium message edit settings associated with a valid subscription to the premium message edit settings, as recited in claim 39.

[0056]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 39, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claims 42-44. Accordingly, claims 42-44 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Serial No.: 10/811,035
Atty Docket No.: MS1-2708US
Atty/Agent: Trevor Lind
-48-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509-324-9256

Conclusion

[0057]   All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.   If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**.   Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant

/Trevor Lind/   Dated: February 27, 2009
Trevor Lind (trevor@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162, x5003)
Registration No. 54785
Emmanuel Rivera (emmanuel@leehayes.com; (512) 505-8162 x5001)
Registration No. 45760
Customer No. **22801**

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com